

891
1896

891

March 24 '30

THE ENGLISH

HISTORICAL REVIEW

C#

EDITED BY

REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A., LL.D.

KEEPER OF THE ARCHIVES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
AND FELLOW OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE AND OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

VOLUME XXV.

1910



LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA

1910

DA

20

.008

.005

.002

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

NO. C.—OCTOBER 1910 *

Rome and Armenia in the Fourth Century

THE aim of the present paper is to inquire into the chronology and the historical value of the work of Faustus of Byzantium, and to attempt to estimate his contribution to our knowledge of Roman history in the fourth century. The thesis from which the paper proceeds is that modern writers have failed to appreciate the importance of that contribution, because of a confusion which occupies a central position in the narrative of Faustus; it is sought to demonstrate that when once this confusion is recognised we may gain a new insight into the relations between east and west, and that, further, we are enabled to institute fresh comparisons with the account of Ammianus Marcellinus, and to judge from the study of an independent authority the value of his narrative. It should be understood from the outset that we are concerned with the internal history of Armenia only so far as may be necessary to understand its influence upon the policy of the Roman empire.¹

The confusion in the work of Faustus to which reference has been made arises from the acceptance by the historian of the view

¹ This paper owes its existence to H. Gelzer's study, 'Die Anfänge der armenischen Kirche,' in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kön. sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, xlvii. (1895), 109–174. I have been unable to touch upon geographical questions and would merely refer the reader to the map of ancient Armenia given by H. Hübschmann, 'Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen, mit Beiträgen zur historischen Topographie Armeniens,' in *Indogermanische Forschungen*, xvi. (1904), 197–490, and to J. Marquart, 'Eränsähr nach der Geographie des Pa. Mosea Xorenac'i,' in *Abhandlungen der kön. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, N.F. iii. no. 2 (1901). Being unfortunately unable to read Armenian, I have used the German translation of Faustus by M. Laufer (Köln, 1879), and it is to this book that reference is made in the following notes.

that Nerses, the great Armenian catholicos, was consecrated by Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea (A.D. 362–370), in the presence of St. Basil, and that, in consequence, this event took place in the reign of Valens. The result of this confusion has been that the name of Valens has been substituted in several cases for that of Constantius, and that, since Faustus mentions no emperor by name except Constantine the Great² and Valens, his chronology has been greatly obscured. In truth, as we shall see shortly, Nerses was not consecrated by Eusebius in the reign of Valens, but (presumably by Bishop Dianius) in the year 389 or 340, when Constantius was ruling over the Roman east.³ If we ask however how this confusion arose, a natural explanation lies ready to our hand. Nerses had been educated at Caesarea and had adopted as his own the aims and methods of the eastern church; he carried out in Armenia the same policy as was followed by St. Basil in Cappadocia; it was Basil who on the murder of Nerses refused to recognise King Pap's nominee, who was consecrated in his despite, an event which led to the independence of the church of Armenia.⁴ Men who looked back upon the old *régime* with longing and who approved of the intimate connexion which had bound nascent Armenian Christianity in the closest ties of intimacy with the see of Caesarea felt that their last great catholicos⁵ must at the most solemn moment in his career have been brought into touch with Basil and with the honoured bishop Eusebius, whom the latter had served so faithfully. Thus in their view Nerses is consecrated by Eusebius, Basil is present at the ceremony, and the holy dove only leaves the head of Basil to settle on that of their national hero: further, an incident from the career of Basil is related at length as an event in the life story of Nerses.⁶ The loving reverence of Armenia has transported a beautiful fancy into the realm of history. The remarkable fact however is that this account has simply been inserted by Faustus into the true historical framework: there has been no consequential chronological displacement;⁷ if the references to Eusebius and Basil (Barsilius) are omitted, and if we

² Faustus, iii. 21, and cf. iii. 10.

³ It is unnecessary to labour the point that Nerses could not have been consecrated in the reign of Valens. One argument among many may be mentioned: Gnel was assassinated by Arsak before A.D. 358, and from the day of the murder the catholicos refused to appear at the king's court (see Faustus, iv. 15, v. 1). It is then impossible that Nerses should only have been consecrated at some date subsequent to the year 364. The chronology of Moses of Chorene is of course quite untrustworthy: it is however worth noticing that according to him Nerses was patriarch for thirty-four years: he was poisoned by Pap some time before A.D. 375 (cf. Moses Chor. iii. 38).

⁴ On this subject cf. Gelzer, *op. cit.* p. 155 *sqq.*

⁵ Cf. Faustus, iv. 4, *s.f.*

⁶ Compare Allard, *Saint Basile* (4th ed., Paris, 1903), p. 81 *sq.*; Greg. Naz. *Or. xlivi.* 54; Soor. iv. 26; Soz. vi. 16; Theod. iv. 16, &c. (on the death of the son of Valens in 372), with Faustus, iv. 5.

⁷ Excepting only the opening words of bk. iii. 13, which are merely resumptive of the close of iii. 10.

read, where necessary, Constantius for Valens, the history of Faustus is a consecutive chronological whole. It is this statement which we shall now proceed to illustrate in some detail so far as the history of the Roman empire is concerned.

The starting point for our study may well be the passage in the panegyric on Constantius in which Julian describes⁸ how Constantius upon his arrival in Asia (after the meeting of the sons of Constantine in 338) restored the fugitive Armenian king to his throne and exiled those nobles who had deserted their sovereign. Now this had always seemed a very remarkable achievement in view of the fact that the armies of the east were disorganised and the defences of the Asian provinces endangered. How came it that Constantius was able to effect so much? We return to the detailed account of Faustus; in barest outline it is as follows: Waras, the Persian satrap of Atrpatakan, had been offended by Tiran,⁹ king of Armenia, and in revenge reported to his master Narses that the king was plotting against Persia; he then treacherously seized the persons of Tiran, the queen, and the young prince Arsak, and carried them prisoners to the Sassanid court, where Tiran was blinded. The feudal nobility of Armenia,¹⁰ after an unsuccessful attempt at recapture and a foray into Persian territory, called a national assembly, at which were present, it is interesting to note, not only the great ones of the land but also representatives of the peasantry and the common folk.¹¹ Feeling their own weakness before the might of Persia, they determined to appeal to the allied empire of Rome.¹² Andok and Arshavir—representatives of two old Armenian houses—were at once despatched to plead the cause of their distressed country. In their absence the Persian king at the head of a vast army marched into Armenia to take formal possession of the land, and with him travelled the royal harem. The nobles fled before him and took refuge within the empire. Now it is almost certain that Arsak was restored to his country by Constantius and ascended the throne in the year 339,¹³ but in the thirtieth year of the reign of Arsak the Armenians looked back over a period of thirty-four years of almost constant hostility with Persia;¹⁴ we are thus led to the conclusion that this enmity began in or about the year 335. It is just at this time that, as we learn from our western authorities, Constantine raised

⁸ Julian (ed. Hertlein), p. 24, 20 *sqq.*

⁹ The Armenian king had failed to send him a particular horse which he coveted (Faustus, iii. 20).

¹⁰ Cf. Gelzer, *op. cit.* p. 132.

¹¹ Faustus, iii. 21.

¹² *Ibid.* (Lauer, p. 46). The treaty of Constantine with Armenia is to be accepted as historical: cf. Gelzer, *op. cit.* pp. 165 *sqq.*

¹³ It is the first operation of Constantius in the east recorded by Julian, *loc. cit.* Cf. Seeck, *sub voce* 'Constantius,' in Pauly-Wissowa, iv. 1, p. 1053.

¹⁴ Faustus, iv. 50.

Hannibalianus to a 'kingdom' (*regnum*)¹⁵ over Armenia and the allied peoples.

Faustus proceeds to relate that, in response to the appeal of the fugitive nobles, the emperor chose Andok and Arshavir as generals, and himself marched to Oscha in the canton of Basan, where the Persians had fixed their camp, surprised the unsuspecting enemy, routed them, and captured the Persian harem. Narses fled into Persia, while Andok and Arshavir were appointed as vice-generals of Rome and the emperor took into his own possession the land of all the Armenian satraps. It is a natural conjecture that Hannibalianus was really the 'emperor' who led this expedition, and the account of Faustus gives us a clear explanation of the institution of a *regnum* over Armenia, which has often created great difficulties for later historians. Hannibalianus was in fact for the time being to represent the captive royal house of Armenia.¹⁶ Constantine in 337 was himself on the point of driving home this success by a campaign against Persia when death overtook him. But what is even more important is that we can now understand how in 339 Constantius was enabled to achieve so startling a success : he held in captivity the Persian harem. The Persian monarch himself sent an embassy praying that at the least his wives might be returned to him and that this horrible blot upon his kingly honour might be removed. The answer of the emperor is thus given by Faustus :

'First,' said he, 'thou shalt give up the prisoners taken captive in Armenia and the king Tiran himself unharmed, together with all the booty which has been carried off. If thou dost this, I will surrender my prisoners which I have taken. But if thou dost not surrender first thy spoil, neither will I surrender my booty.'

The bargain was struck : Tiran returned to Armenia but refused on account of his blindness to resume his kingship, and his son Arsak ascended the throne. With honourable escort and queenly pomp the Sassanid harem was restored by Constantius and the Persian captives released. It would seem that at this time the emperor, in order to secure the loyalty of Armenia,¹⁷ took as hostages Gnel and Tirith, the nephews of Arsak.

Julian the panegyrist suggests that force had won a victory which, as appears from Faustus, was in fact a diplomatic triumph. The two accounts however supplement each other : Julian tells us that Constantius banished those Armenian nobles who had deserted the cause of their king ; we learn from Faustus that Arsak broke

¹⁵ Cf. Amm. xiv. 1, 2, 'Hannibaliano regi.' See the note of Valesius on this passage (in Wagner's edition, i. 3-4), and the citations given by Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, under the year 335. Compare Professor Bury's appendix to Gibbon, ii. (1897). 561.

¹⁶ We need not conclude that the arrangement was intended to be permanent.

¹⁷ Cf. Faustus, iv. 5 *sub fin.*

up the power of the feudal nobility by distributing their armed followers in various parts of the country, and thus weakened the force of local connexions. The one measure is manifestly a sequel of the other.¹⁸

The intervention of the Roman empire brought with it the general supremacy of Greek ideas under the restored monarchy : church and state were both alike to be reorganised, and accordingly a new catholicos was selected without delay.¹⁹ Nerses had been educated on Roman soil, and was ready to introduce into Armenia the institutions of which he had learned from his teachers at Caesarea.²⁰ The account of Faustus implies that his consecration followed almost immediately upon the accession of Arsak (late in 339 or early in 340). Faustus, having described the new system inaugurated by Nerses, tells of an embassy to Constantius ('Valens') headed by the catholicos, and of the latter's detention for nine years by the Roman emperor. This account has been rejected as incredible,²¹ and we must therefore consider when this embassy of Nerses took place, and whether the chronology of Faustus must be dismissed as untenable. It is essential for this purpose to have before us a scheme of the order of events according to Faustus. The following is a brief outline :—

- Book iv. c. 1—The restoration of Tiran to Armenia and the beginning of the rule of Arsak.
- c. 2—Administrative and military reorganisation of Armenia.
- c. 3—Election of Nerses ; sketch of his early life.
- c. 4—His consecration at Caesarea and his reforms.
- c. 5—His embassy to 'Valens' and his imprisonment (here the incident from the life of Basil has been introduced).²² The persecutions of the Arian emperor 'Valens' ; he restores the hostages Gnel and Tirith, and sends costly presents to the king of Armenia while detaining Nerses.
- c. 6—Nerses is banished to an island, and for nine years the emperor refuses to permit his return to Armenia.
- cc. 7-10—Incidents from the lives of Eusebius and Basil.²³
- c. 11—The return of the embassy from 'Valens' ; wrath of Arsak at the detention of Nerses. Wasak the Armenian leads an expedition into Roman territory as far as Ancyra, and after this for six years in succession conducts forays into Roman territory.
- c. 12—Bishop Chad, the representative of Nerses during his absence, continues the policy of the catholicos and resists Arsak.

¹⁸ Faustus, iii. c. 21, *s.f.* Lauer, p. 48. This was throughout his reign the policy of Arsak : cf. iv. 12, Lauer, p. 80 *sqq.* ; iv. 19, Lauer, p. 101 ; cf. Gelzer, *op. cit.* p. 154 *sqq.*

¹⁹ Faustus, iv. 3, Lauer, p. 51.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, Lauer, p. 52.

²¹ For the chronology of Faustus see Gelzer's criticisms, *op. cit.* p. 118.

²² See above, p. 626 note 6.

²³ A reason for the insertion of these passages has been suggested above, p. 626.

- c. 13—The return of Nerses and his opposition to Arsak.
- c. 14—Incident of Nerses and the master of the Harem Hair.
- c. 15—Arsak puts to death his nephews Gnel and Tirith and marries Gnel's widow against her will. Because of her continued hatred he sends to Rome for a wife and marries Olympias.

At this point we reach a date which we can check from our western authorities : we are at some year subsequent to A.D. 350.²⁴

To return then to 339 : Arsak was naturally anxious that his throne should be protected from Persian aggression, and that the friendship of Rome should be a real and effective defence. As soon therefore as Nerses had set on foot his reorganisation of the church, the account of Faustus gives us to understand that the king sent his greatest subject and Rome's pupil on an embassy to the emperor. We might expect that this would take place about 341. Faustus gives us no exact date, but he does tell us that at this time a great church council had been called together and that as a result many of the orthodox bishops were banished and Arian successors appointed in their place ; Nerses shared the banishment of these deposed bishops. This would however be an accurate description of the great synod of Antioch, which after sitting for three years ultimately broke up in the year 341.²⁵ The detention of Nerses may thus with considerable probability be assigned to this year. What was then the reason which led Constantius to take this step ? It may of course be suggested that Nerses was a more valuable hostage than two princes who would not be the direct successors of Arsak, should he have a son ; but the action of Constantius was probably dictated by more far-reaching considerations. His efforts at this time were directed to securing the victory of the Arian doctrine in the eastern church : Roman influence had been re-established in Armenia : the tie which throughout its history drew Armenia towards Rome was a common faith, but no one can study the subsequent relations of the two countries without perceiving the fatal consequences of a difference in the creeds professed at Dovin and Constantinople. The emperor was not content to protect fellow-Christians ; he felt himself impelled to attempt the work of their conversion.²⁶ It would seem that the statesmanship of Constantius had already appreciated the support which would be gained for Roman authority in the east if one and the same creed united the church of the empire with that of Armenia. In the latter country the cult and the forms of worship

²⁴ Probably A.D. 354, see below, p. 632 (cf. Ammianus Marcellinus, *xx. 11*, Athan *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* 69).

²⁵ For a convenient summary of its work cf. Seeck, *sub voce* 'Constantius,' in Pauly-Wissowa, iv. 1.

²⁶ Compare especially the history of the latter part of the sixth and the first part of the seventh centuries.

had always been imposed upon the people by authority :²⁷ it was indeed only through the activity of the monks and the work of Mesrob in the fifth century that Christianity became in any real sense a national faith : in the fourth century Christianity in Armenia was a human ordinance and was acquiesced in by the people just as they bowed to any other royal command.²⁸ If Constantius could convert the catholicos, he had gained Armenia. He could afford to provoke insignificant border forays if this was the price which had to be paid for a great and permanent victory in the sphere of religious diplomacy. Nerses however refused to bow to imperial persuasion : the school of Caesarea had done its work too well.

Nine years, says Faustus, was Nerses in exile, and nine years from 341 take us down to the year 350. Now 350 is the very year of the revolt of Magnentius, when Constantius left Asia for his western campaign. We know from Ammianus Marcellinus²⁹ that when Constantius was starting in 360 to meet the usurper Julian he summoned Arsak to his court and crowded favours upon him in order to secure his loyalty : in the same way when he set forth in 350 he would seem to have bound the Armenians to the Roman alliance by restoring to them their revered catholicos. The pressing need for present tranquillity in the Roman east drove him to relinquish his wider schemes for Armenia's conversion. If this be the true explanation, it is to Faustus alone that we owe a deeper insight into the emperor's statesmanship and his loyalty to his great trust.³⁰

As we have seen from the analysis previously given, after the return of Nerses, which we may provisionally place in A.D. 350, Faustus gives an account of the deaths of Gnel and Tirith and of the forced marriage of Gnel's widow Pharrantsem with Arsak. Her dislike for this union caused the king to ask a wife of the emperor. Ammianus Marcellinus informs us that Constantius complied with the request and sent Olympias to the Armenian court ; she was the daughter of the former praetorian praefect Ablabius, and had been *sponsa* of the emperor's brother Constans ; the latter however died in 350, and therefore it is only after that date that his betrothed could have become the wife of Arsak. Further we learn³¹

²⁷ Cf. H. Gelzer, 'Zur armenischen Götterlehre,' in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der kön. sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 1896, ii. iii. (1897), p. 122 : 'Der Gottesdienst wird also einfach von oben octroyirt. Im Orient ist es zu allen Zeiten so gewesen.'

²⁸ Cf. Faustus, iii. 13, Lauer, p. 27 : 'Schon längst, von der Zeit an, da [die Armenier] den Namen des Christentums angenommen, hatten sie dieses allein als menschliches Gesetz und nicht mit glühendem Glauben, sondern als einen der Menschheit aufgenötigten Betrug hingenommen, nicht wie es sich gebürt hätte, mit Wissen, Vertrauen und Glauben.'

²⁹ See below, p. 634.

³⁰ As already noted (p. 626 note 7) the insertion of the extraneous material in bk. iii. 8-10 which close with the death of Valens has produced a confusion in the resumptive sentence at the beginning of c. 13.

³¹ Lauer, p. 95.

that Arsak did not travel in person to fetch his consort, and we therefore naturally expect to find some mention of a mission from Constantius to act as conduct for so distinguished a lady. It is thus a natural conjecture that this was the purpose of the journey into Armenia of Taurus the quaestor, which according to Ammianus took place in 354. The matter is only mentioned incidentally by the Roman historian and no reason is given, but we do know that Taurus was despatched upon his errand directly from the court of Constantius.³² If this explanation be correct, the marriage of Arsak with Olympias took place in 354. It was not long however before she fell a victim to the craft of Pharrantsem, and the Armenian king might thus naturally expect to have aroused the wrath of Rome and be predisposed to turn to the protection of Persia. King Sapor was absent at this time waging a long and distant frontier war, but the forays of his generals upon Armenia were evidence of his disapproval of Arsak's alliance with the empire.³³ Disunion had rent the Mambikonian house—one of the greatest families amongst the Armenian nobility ; the elder brother Wardan favoured alliance with Persia, while the younger, the general-in-chief Wasak, was loyal to the empire. Sapor with the help of Wardan induced Arsak to journey to the Persian court, and there forced him to swear a solemn oath upon the gospel that he would be loyal to Persia and would have no dealings with Rome. But Wasak, envious of Wardan's success, warned the king of Persian treachery, and Arsak fled. Supported by the queen Pharrantsem, whose former husband had been slain by Wardan, Wasak murdered his brother : again Armenia seemed driven into the arms of Rome.

At this point the chronology of Faustus supports our conjectural date for the marriage of Olympias. From the flight of the king down to the time of the peace of Jovian, when hostilities between Armenia and Persia broke out afresh (*i.e.* in 364), eight years elapsed.³⁴ The flight of Arsak from Persia must accordingly be placed in A.D. 356, which is precisely the period which we might have expected. Between 354 and 356 fell the murder of Olympias and Arsak's consequent fear of the wrath of Rome.

But suddenly the position of affairs in the east assumed a new complexion. Sapor's frontier wars were over and he therefore abruptly terminated the negotiations for peace which had been opened by the praetorian praefect Musonianus.³⁵ A Persian embassy demanded that Mesopotamia and Armenia should be surrendered by Rome, and an immediate invasion of the empire was threatened

³² Amm. xiv. 11, 14.

³³ Amm. xv. 13, 4 : 'Persici duces vicini fluminibus, rege (*i.e.* Sapor) in ultimis terrarum suarum terminis occupato, per praedatorios globos nostra verabant, nunc Armeniam, aliquoties Mesopotamiam confidentius incursante, Romanis ductoribus ad colligendas obedientium exuvias occupatis.'

³⁴ Faustus, iv. 21.

³⁵ Cf. Amm. Marcellinus, xvi. 9. 1-4, xvii. 5.

if these terms were refused. Envoys from Constantius professed willingness to conclude an honourable peace but would not hear of the cession of Armenia or Mesopotamia.³⁶ Thus with every prospect of a renewal of the struggle between the two powers Arsak 'looked forth to see who first of the contending parties would sue for his support in the war. He waited, since his desire was to march to the help of the emperor of Greece, but the Greeks did not invite his assistance and showed him neither regard nor honour.'³⁷ The explanation is simple: Constantius was far distant in Sirmium; and affairs in Asia were in hopeless confusion, for Ursicinus had been removed and Sabinianus was utterly incapable. There was no statesman in the east to secure the support of Armenia's king. Sapor, on the other hand, sent an embassy courteously requesting alliance: 'If thou art on our side,' wrote the Persian monarch, 'the victory is ours.' Arsak was won, and his general Wasak was ordered to raise an army. An attack on Nisibis was planned, which was to be supported by the troops of Persia, but, as their arrival was delayed, the Armenian soldiers forced their king to take immediate action. The foray upon the country round Nisibis was successful and the booty captured was enormous (A.D. 359). Such is the account of Faustus, and though the part played by Arsak is not mentioned by our western authorities, the latter tend to support the Armenian historian.³⁸

Ursicinus had been ordered by Constantius to return to the east, but he could effect little as his position was now that of a subordinate to Sabinianus. The first act of Ursicinus was to hurry with all speed to Nisibis in order to improve its defences, and on the way he was all but captured by marauding parties of the enemy.³⁹ Further we know that the Persian army was delayed by the magnitude of its preparations: it was midsummer before the Tigris was crossed. Sapor's plan of campaign had been to strike for Syria, but he was detained by the long siege of Amida. He did not intend to attack Nisibis, and the devastation about that city was only committed by *vastatoria manus* of the enemy.⁴⁰ The narrative of Faustus at once elucidates and supplements Ammianus's account.

Persia as a reward for this harrying of the empire offered Armenia alliance and proposed that Arsak should wed Sapor's daughter; a new marriage should consecrate the new loyalty; the celebrations should take place in Assyria. The Armenian troops however refused to leave the country, for each man longed to return to his home;

³⁶ The references are conveniently collected by Seeck, in *Pauly-Wissowa*, iv. 1, pp. 1083-4.

³⁷ Faustus, iv. 20, Lauer, p. 101.

³⁸ That Wasak acted *against* as well as for Rome is also implied in the figure of the two mountains: Faustus, iv. 54, Lauer, p. 134.

³⁹ Cf. Amm. xviii. 6.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 7, 4; 6, 9.

it has always been difficult to hold together for any long period an army composed of feudal levies. Andok, the father of the queen Pharrantsem, fearing that his own daughter might be despised if Arsak married a Persian princess, won over by wholesale bribery a noble of the Sassanid court and a large number of Armenian satraps. One and all professed that the overtures of Sapor were inspired by a treacherous desire to secure the person of Arsak. The Armenian king fled precipitately and the negotiations were fruitless.⁴¹

Constantius was now himself in the east : he realised the omissions of his agents ; if he were to feel free to leave Asia in order to combat the rebel Julian, the loyalty of Arsak must be regained. The passage of Ammianus, xx. 11, 1-3, is highly important in this connexion :

Constantius adgitum Arsacen Armeniae regem summaque liberalitate susceptum praemonebat et hortabatur ut nobis amicus preseveraret et fidus. Audiebat enim saepius eum temptatum a rege Persarum fallaciis et minis et dolis, ut Romanorum societate posthabita suis rationibus stringeretur. Qui crebro adiurans animam prius posse amittere quam sententiam, muneras cum comitibus quos duxerat redit ad regnum nihil ausus temerare *postea* promissorum, obligatus gratiarum multiplici nexu Constantio.

It might be suggested that in the word *postea* we have an implicit recognition by Ammianus of the truth of the account of Faustus. The western author in his turn is corroborated by the Armenian historian :

For eight years after the departure and flight of King Arsak of Armenia from the Persian king Sapor (as we have seen A.D. 356) the Persian king spoke no word of enmity. Rather he carried on negotiations adopting quite a humble tone, and besought King Arsak of Armenia to remain in close and friendly ties of alliance with him. For the king of Persia was in pressing danger of immediate and ceaseless armed attacks from the king of the Greeks. Yet King Arsak of Armenia would not yield to his entreaties or meet him, and if the king of Persia sent ambassadors to him he refused either to give presents or draw near to him at all ; he would not even hear the ambassadors' names. Still the king of Persia sent very often to him presents and ambassadors, but came with all speed to terms with the king of Greece.⁴²

Thus was Arsak loyal alike to Constantius and Julian, not merely rejecting the overtures of Persia but during the war of 363-4 even ravaging Chilioocomum on Julian's instructions.⁴³ In 364 the peace of Jovian was signed ; the terms are thus given by Faustus :

The emperor of Greece sealed and subscribed a treaty wherein was written 'I have given unto thee the town Mdsbin (Nisibis) which lies in Arorestan,

⁴¹ Faustus, iv. 20.

⁴² *Ibid.* 21.

⁴³ For the ravaging of Chilioocomum, cf. Amm. xxv. 7, 12. Why Arsak took no more effective action against Persia during Julian's campaign still remains obscure. Libanius hints at mutual jealousies amongst the Roman commanders, but it is noticeable that during the fourth century we hardly ever hear of unprovoked attacks upon Persia by Armenia. Arsak was forced to depend upon the forces of a feudal nobility

Assyrian Mesopotamia, and the half of Armenia. I permit thee if thou art able to conquer and subdue the same : I will not come to their help.' Forced and in dire distress the king of Greece subscribed to this form of words as his decree and gave it to the king of Persia.

Vengeance for the ravaging of Chilioocomum and freedom to invade Armenia at his will were among the ends which Sapor sought to obtain by this treaty.⁴⁴

Ammianus himself seems not to admit⁴⁵ that by the terms of Jovian's surrender Persia was allowed a free hand in Armenia, but his history as a whole serves only to confirm the view that Faustus has given us an accurate summary of the treaty.⁴⁶ Forthwith in 364

who were deeply influenced by Persian thought and culture. Cf. Gutschmid, 'Über die Glaubwürdigkeit der armenischen Geschichte des Moses von Khoren' in *Kleine Schriften*, iii. p. 282 *sqq.* at p. 291 : 'In Abstammung Sprache und Sage hing das armenische Volk mit Iran zusammen, die Cultur des Adcls war eine persische und ist es in Armenien und seinen Nebenländern trotz der Verschiedenheit der Religion bis auf die neueste Zeit geblieben'; and H. Gelzer, 'Zur armenischen Götterlehre,' *loc. cit.* p. 103 *sqq.* It is further important to notice that the natural difficulties of the march were considerable. These detained Bindoës and John when on their way to join the Roman forces under Narsea in 591 : they were advancing from Armenia towards the river Zab. Cf. Theophylact, Sim. v. 8, 3, De Boor, p. 202, 22 : ὡς δὴ τῆς περὶ τὴν Ἀρμενίαν Πարսկῆς στρατοπέδευσεως διὰ τὴν δυσχωρίαν τῶν τόπων οὐχ ολας τε οὐσης συνάπτεσθαι ταῖς ἐφασι τῶν Πարσαν δυνάμεσιν; and see H. C. Rawlinson, 'Notes on a Journey from Tabriz through Persian Kurdistan,' &c., *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, x. (1840), p. 1 *sqq.*, and his memoir on the site of the Atropatenian Ecbatana, *ibid.* at p. 71 *sqq.*

⁴⁴ Cf. Amm. xxv. 7, 12 : Quibus exitiale aliud accessit et impium ne post haec ita composita Araci poscenti contra Persas ferretur auxilium amico nobis semper (i.e. all through the recent war) et fido. Quod ratione genuina cogitatum est ut puniatur homo qui Chilioocomum mandatu vastaverat principis et remaneret occasio per quam subinde licenter invaderetur Armenia. See also Zosimus, iii. 31, 2 : προσαφείλοντο δὲ καὶ Ἀρμενίας τὸ πολὺ μέρος οἱ Πέρσαι, βραχὺ τε ταῦτης Παρσαῖς ἔχειν ἐνδόντες; and Libanius, Förster, ii. p. 518, l. 12, 'Ἀρμενία πᾶσα was surrendered to the enemy.'

⁴⁵ Cf. Amm. xxvi. 4, 6 : Persarum rex manus Armenii iniebat, eos in suam dicionem ex integro vocare vi nimia properans sed iniuste causando quod post Ioviani excessum cum quo foedera firmarat et pacem nihil obstat debet quo minus ea recuperaret quae antea ad maiores suos pertinuisse monstrabat. In this passage Ammianus seems to base the claim of Persia on the fact of the death of Jovian: Persia by his decease was freed from her obligations. This can hardly be intended. Elsewhere Sapor's claim is that he is free to act in Armenia because of and not in spite of the treaty of Jovian. Cf. Amm. xxvii. 12, 1-2 (quoted below, p. 636).

⁴⁶ Cf. Amm. xxv. 7, 12, quoted above, note 44.

xxvii. 12, 10 : sed pro tempore adiumentis negatis per Terentium ducem Para reducitur in Armeniam recturus interim sine ulla insignibus gentem, quod ratione iusta est observatum ne fracti foederis nos argueremur et pacis.

xxvii. 12, 15. After the arrival of count Arinthæus in Armenia the Persians did not at once invade the country, 'hoo solo contenti quod ad imperatorem misere legatos petentes nationem eamdem ut sibi et Ioviano placuerat non defendi.'

xxvii. 12, 18, after Roman interference in Hiberia : 'his percitus Sapor pati se exclamans indigna quod contra foederum textum iuvarentur Armenii.'

xxix. 1, 2. Trajan and Vadomar are only to act on the defensive, 'hoc observare principis iussu adpositi ut arcerent potius quam lacesserent Persas . . . s. 3, operaque consulta retrocedentes ne ferro violenter adversorum quemquam primi et iudicarentur discessi foederis rei, ultima trudente necessitate congressi sunt.'

Sapor began to enforce his conception of his rights,⁴⁷ and endeavoured to subject Armenia.⁴⁸

Calcata fide sub Ioviano pactorum iniectabat Armeniae manum ut eam velut placitorum abolita firmitate ditioni iungeret suae. Et primo per artes fallendo diversas nationem omnem renitentem dispendiis levibus afflictabat sollicitans quosdam optimatum et satrapas, alias excursibus occupans improvisis.⁴⁹

Faustus gives us the detailed commentary on these words of Ammianus :⁵⁰ between 364 and 369 he chronicles twenty-seven forays into Armenia. For most of these Merushan, an Armenian fugitive who had become a convert to the Magian religion, acted as guide : one expedition was led by prince Dekhan, of the Armenian Mamikonian house ; another by Suren Pahlav, a relative of Arsak ; while two others were captained respectively by Hrevshoghum, of the same race as Arsak, and Aghanaiosan, a Pahlav of the Arsacid house. The history of the Armenian writer is thus a complete corroboration of that which Ammianus says was the result of the peace of Jovian : ‘Unde postea contigit ut . . . Armeniae maximum latus Medis conterminans inter dissensiones et turbamenta raperent Parthi.’⁵¹ As a result of the wholesale defections of the Armenian nobility the kingdom fell into utter disorder :⁵² the king was distrusted and the counsels of Nerses were disregarded :⁵³ subjection to a fire-worshipping heathen seemed less terrible than the unbearable sufferings from constant rapine and slaughter. Only Andok, the king’s father-in-law, and Wasak his general remained loyal,⁵⁴ and ultimately Arsak was compelled against his will to submit to Persia⁵⁵ and to journey with Wasak to the court of Sapor.⁵⁶ In the thirtieth year of his reign he gave up the long struggle.⁵⁷ This is an important point gained for the chronology of the eastern question as it affects the policy of Valens. Reiche,⁵⁸ relying only on inferences from Ammianus, had conjecturally placed the capture of Arsaces in the years 364–366 : we now know that it did not occur till the end of 368 or the beginning of 369.⁵⁹

⁴⁷ Faustus, iv. 21, Lauer p. 107, Amm. xxvi. 4, 6 (quoted above, p. 635 note 45).

⁴⁸ In what follows I presume a knowledge of F. Reiche’s *Chronologie der letzten 6 Bücher des Ammianus Marcellinus* (Liegnitz, 1889), and of O. Seeck’s ‘Zur Chronologie und Quellenkritik des Ammianus Marcellinus’ in *Hermes*, xli. (1906) pp. 480–539.

⁴⁹ Amm. xxvii. 12, 1–2.

⁵⁰ Faustus, iv. cc. 21–49. The numbers of the invaders are doubtless grossly exaggerated, cf. Hans Delbrück, *Geschichte der Kriegskunst*, II. ii. c. iv. Zahlen, p. 298 *sqq.*

⁵¹ Amm. xxv. 7, 12.

⁵² Faustus, iv. c. 50.

⁵³ *Ibid.* c. 51.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* c. 51.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* c. 52.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* c. 53.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* c. 54, cf. c. 51 *ad init.* Wasak was put to death in Persia.

⁵⁸ Reiche, *op. cit.* c. 6, p. 27 *sqq.*

⁵⁹ Arsak’s death took place at a considerably later date: Faustus, v. 7. Ammianus, xxxii. 12, 3, in fact anticipates the death of Arsak. *Deinde* (in xxvii. 12, 4) means ‘after Arsak’s capture,’ which is the real subject of xxvii. 12, 3.

With Arsak in his power, the Persian king began the work of the total subjection of Armenia and the establishment of fire-worship in that country. Faustus is only concerned with the history of his own people, but we learn from Ammianus⁶⁰ that Sapor took the further step of interfering in the affairs of Hiberia (in 369 it would appear). He drove out Sauromaces, who had been raised to the throne through the influence of Rome, and instated Aspacures, conferring upon him a diadem in recognition of Persia's overlordship. In Armenia the queen with 11,000 men⁶¹ took refuge in the fortress of Artagherk.⁶² At this point in his narrative Ammianus tells us that two prominent Armenian renegades, Cylaces and Artabannes, who were besieging the fortress, played Sapor false, and failing in their endeavours to induce Pharrantsem to surrender allowed her son Pap (Para) to escape from Artagherk and take refuge in Roman territory.⁶³ In view of the many Armenian nobles who acted now for their country and now for the interests of Persia⁶⁴ it is hardly surprising that Cylaces and Artabannes are not mentioned by Faustus.⁶⁵ He does not however contradict Ammianus's account : we learn from him that while the Persians were ravaging Armenia and the long blockade of the castle of Artagherk continued, Mushegh, son of the murdered general Wasak, joined Pap on Roman soil and appealed to the emperor for his support. But Valens feared to violate the terms of the peace of Jovian ; he clearly felt that his right to interfere was doubtful, and considered that he could satisfy his scruples by a compromise : Terentius, the Roman dux, should return with Pap, but the troops of Rome should not oppose Persia ; the Arsacid prince should assert his own authority, if he had the power, but the emperor would not confer upon him the insignia of a king.⁶⁶ It was a futile step while at the moment Sapor was harrying all Armenia, and it is remarkable that Faustus does not date the accession of Pap from this period, although he recognises the goodwill displayed by Rome.⁶⁷ Messages came from Pap⁶⁸ to Pharrantsem

⁶⁰ xxvii. 12, 4.

⁶¹ So at least Faustus, iv. c. 55.

⁶² Artogerassa : Amm. xxvii. 12, 5.

⁶³ Valens accorded him a residence at Neocaesarea, which naturally incensed Sapor.

⁶⁴ Cf. Meruschan, especially at v. 38.

⁶⁵ Their names were well known to the Romans, as their subsequent murder by King Pap was one of the arguments against that monarch raised by Terentius at a later date in his despatches to the emperor : Amm. xxx. i. 3.

⁶⁶ Amm. xxvii. 12, 10.

⁶⁷ Cf. Lauer, p. 136 : Während sie (the ambassadors) mit dem Könige der Griechen verhandelten, vermochten sie diese, ihnen Hilfe zu bringen. This embassy, it may be noted, was, it seems, planned by Cylaces and Artabannes after they had permitted the escape of Pap : 'Qua humanitate (Cylaces et Artabannes) illecti (i.e. Valens' welcome of Pap) missis oratoribus ad Valentem auxilium eundemque Param sibi regem tribui pososcerunt,' Amm. xxvii. 12, 9.

⁶⁸ 'From her son Arsak,' as Faustus says, iv. 56. This is, of course, only the standing title of all Armenian kings ; cf. Professor Bury's note to Gibbon, ii. p. 564.

week after week bidding her be of good hope and not surrender. But Rome would give no military help, and before Sapor's ravages the Armenian prince, with Cylaces and Artabannes, was forced to take refuge in the mountainous district which divided Lazica from the territory of the empire.⁶⁹ Faustus gives a terrible picture of pillage and rapine in Armenia (370): at length in the fourteenth month the garrison could hold out no longer; the queen was carried off to her death, and Artashat, Waghsharapat, Sarehavan, and other towns fell into the hands of Persia.⁷⁰ Sapor appointed generals to hold the captured forts; Sik and Karen were left in command of the troops, while the Armenian renegades, Wahan and Merushan, were entrusted with the government of Armenia and the introduction of the Magian religion.⁷¹

At last, in 371,⁷² Valens decided that he could not allow the Armenians to suffer unprotected, should the Persian ravages begin afresh; he took effective action, and despatched Count Arinthaeus⁷³ with an army.⁷⁴ Terentius had accompanied Pap to Armenia in the former year. It is precisely at this point that Faustus tells of the successful result of Mushegh's mission and of the accession of Pap. 'The great king of the Greeks made Pap, the son of Arsak, king over the land of Armenia, as Mushegh had prayed of him. The king of Greece became a strong support of Armenia, and sent a general, by name Terentius, and a Count Ade with six million men in the train of King Pap to Armenia.'⁷⁵ Count Ade is not mentioned by Ammianus,⁷⁶ but it can hardly be doubted that this is the Addaeus whom we know as *comes domesticorum* under Theodosius I, and who in 393 held the position of *magister utriusque militiae per Orientem*.⁷⁷ The army of Rome now occupied the country: the newly erected fire-temples were destroyed, while Nerves left his retirement⁷⁸ and supported the restored monarchy; the captured fortresses were

⁶⁹ Amm. xxvii. 12, 11.

⁷⁰ Faustus, iv. 55. It was in the winter of 370, *sidere flagrante brumali*: Amm. xxvii. 12, 12.

⁷¹ Faustus, iv. 58–59. Wahan was soon after slain by his own son: Lauer, p. 144. On the efforts to set up the Persian religion, compare Moses of Choren, iii. 36, and thereon Gutschmid, *op. cit.* p. 290. It is interesting to notice that at this time military and civil authority are separated and the former is given to Persian officers. It might be suggested that this was due to the fact of the disloyalty to Persia of the Armenian Cylaces and Artabannes; cf. Amm. xxvii. 12, 5: 'Cylaci spadoni et Artabanni quos olim suscepserat (sc. Sapor) perfugas commisit Armeniam—horum alter ante gentis praefectus, alter magister fuisse dicebatur armorum—iisdem mandarat ut Artogerassam . . . excinderent.' Apparently Armenian renegades were entrusted with the military command in the first instance.

⁷² Cf. Reiche, *op. cit.* p. 29.

⁷³ He had recently (at the end of 369) been conducting operations on the Danube.

⁷⁴ Amm. xxvii. 12, 13.

⁷⁵ Faustus, v. 1, a good example of the Armenian's exaggeration in regard to numbers.

⁷⁶ But compare Moses of Choren, iii. 37.

⁷⁷ Cf. O. Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius*, p. 48.

⁷⁸ Cf. *supra*, p. 626 note 3.

recovered, and the Roman troops were quartered 'in Errand and Bachischu through the whole land of Armenia, through all the cantons.'⁷⁹ Persia did not repeat the pillage of the previous year, but resorted to diplomacy: Sapor counselled Pap that Cylaces and Artabannes were plotting against him and they were in consequence beheaded; meanwhile an embassy complained to the emperor that this support of Armenia was in breach of the terms of the peace of Jovian. But Valens had taken action and he did not repent.⁸⁰ Hiberia was partitioned, and the Roman nominee was made king over that part of the country which bordered on Armenia and Lazica, Sauromaces being left to rule over the district which adjoined Persia. Once more Sapor protested and prepared for war.⁸¹

In this year (372) the Armenian general Mushegh invaded the territory of Persia, and attacked the camp of Sapor which was pitched at Thauresh in Atrpatakan. Many captives were taken, among them some of Sapor's wives, who were honourably restored to their master by Mushegh. It is important to notice that Faustus, in entire agreement with Ammianus, states that this was a victory of the *Armenian* troops: the Roman leaders only shared the booty.⁸² Terentius with his twelve legions was indeed in all probability in Hiberia at the time of this campaign.

Valens had not as yet engaged Persia directly, but in 373 came the battle of Vagabanta (Ammianus) or Bagavan (Faustus), in which the Roman troops were forced to resist the Persian army. Ammianus writes as follows:

Exacta hieme rex Persarum gentis Sapor pugnarum fiducia pristinarum immaniter arrogans, suppleto numero suorum abundeque firmato erupturos in nostra cataphractos et sagittarios et conductam misit plebem... [Count Trajan and Vadomar are bidden to act on the defensive] qui cum venissent Vagabanta legionibus habilem locum rapidos turmarum pro-cursus hostilium in se ruentium acriter excepérunt inviti; operaque consulta retrocedentes ne ferro violarent adversorum quemquam primi et iudicarentur discessi foederis rei, ultima trudente necessitate congressi sunt: confossisque multis discessere victores.⁸³

The parallelism of the account of Faustus is instructive: he emphasises the magnitude of the enemy's forces: Urnair, king of Aghovia, claimed gifts from Sapor and undertook to oppose the Armenian satraps, the Persian troops were to attack the Romans.⁸⁴ Sapor himself marched as far as Atrpatakan and there halted; the main army he sent forward into the heart of Armenia.⁸⁵ King

⁷⁹ Faustus, v. 1, Lauer, p. 147.

⁸⁰ Valens reached Antioch in April 372.

⁸¹ For the details of these measures read Amm. xxvii. 12, 14-18. The operations were carried out by Terentius with twelve legions.

⁸² Faustus, v. 2.

⁸³ xxix. 1, 1-2.

⁸⁴ Cf. *conducta plebs* in Ammianus.

⁸⁵ Cf. Amm., *misit*.

Pap gave orders to concentrate his own men in Bagavan while the Roman allies marched from Errand and encamped near the Euphrates. Terentius⁸⁶ would not allow the Armenian king to fight in person : his master would hold him guilty if any harm were to come to the king. The united forces won a great victory over the Persian host. In this battle, in striking agreement with Ammianus, Faustus tells us for the first time that the Roman legions took part in the actual fighting.⁸⁷ Ammianus proceeds : 'inter moras tamen utrimquesecus tentatis aliquotiens levibus proeliis varioque finitis eventu pactis induitiis ex consensu aestateque consumpta (A.D. 373) partium discessere ductores etiamtum discordes.'⁸⁸ Faustus gives an account of the success of the Armenians and Romans at Gantsak in Atrpatakan⁸⁹ and then with him too follows a peace. Mushegh proceeds to subdue the disloyal Armenians and the neighbouring peoples.⁹⁰

Nerses had now resumed his former commanding position in affairs of state, but the catholicos was hated by his sovereign. Fear of Rome alone stayed Pap's hand,⁹¹ but at length he murdered the patriarch ; and when Caesarea refused to consecrate the king's nominee, Pap broke through the long tradition and caused Iusik to be consecrated in Basil's despite. He himself began to reduce the privileges and property of the Christian church and favoured the restoration of the national paganism.⁹² Such actions and the unfavourable despatches of Terentius led Valens to extend a kingly invitation to Pap : once on Roman soil the honoured guest became a prisoner (374 ?), while Terentius counselled that Valens should enthrone a new king in Armenia.⁹³ Fleeing from Tarsus through many dangers and difficulties Pap escaped to his own country with 300 followers.⁹⁴ Of this journey into the territory of the empire Faustus says nothing, but he tells us that soon after the death of Nerses the king began by embassies to pave the way for alliance with Persia.⁹⁵ We learn that he sent to Valens the astonishing demand : 'Caesarea and ten towns belong to us ; give them up : the city of Urha was also built by our ancestors ; if you do not desire to arouse confusion give them up ; if you refuse then we will fight for them in violent

⁸⁶ Terentius, though not mentioned by Ammianus in connexion with this battle, was still in Armenia, cf. Amm. xxx. 1, 3.

⁸⁷ I have of set purpose suppressed all mention of those details in the account of Faustus which are more directly concerned with the internal affairs of Armenia : see the whole chapter, v. 4.

⁸⁸ Amm. xxix. 1, 4.

⁸⁹ Faustus, v. 5.

⁹⁰ Faustus, v. 8-20. Sapor retired to Ctesiphon, Valens to Antioch, Amm. xxix. 1, 4 (winter 373-4). The conspiracy of Theodorus engaged the latter's attention.

⁹¹ Faustus, v. 23.

⁹² See the highly interesting chapter, Faustus, v. 31.

⁹³ Amm. xxx. 1, 1-4.

⁹⁴ Amm. xxx. 5, 17.

⁹⁵ Cf. Amm. xxx. 2, 1 : 'Param (=Pap) sociare sibi impendio conabatur Sapor.' Ammian appears to regard Para as an innocent against whom Rome had sinned without provocation ; not so Faustus. For this claim to Caesarea and Edessa cf. Marquart *Eransähr*, p. 160.

warfare.' Mushegh and the Armenian nobles pleaded with the king that he should remain loyal to Rome; but to no purpose. The story of the order for Pap's murder sent secretly by the emperor and the method of its execution is given by both authors, the only difference of any moment being that the feast at which the king was assassinated was according to Ammianus's version planned by Trajan, while Faustus ascribes the scheme to Terentius and Addaeus. It was probably a concerted plot on the part of all three commanders.⁹⁶ The Armenian nobles determined that they could ill afford to make both Rome and Persia their enemies and decided to attempt no revenge for the death of their king.⁹⁷ Sapor, in place of Pap, whom he had every hope of winning to his side, saw (A.D. 375) the Roman army of occupation instal with great pomp⁹⁸ an Arsacid princeling Warasdat upon the throne as nominee of the empire.

Persia resorted once more to diplomacy. A legate, Arsaces by name, proposed to Valens that Armenia, the apple of constant discord, should be divided between the two empires, or, if this was not agreeable to Rome, let the emperor withdraw his garrisons from Hiberia. The embassy is important as foreshadowing the partition of 387. During the autumn of 375 and through the year 376 it would seem that the negotiations continued. Victor, the *magister equitum*, and Urbicius, the *dux Mesopotamiae*, were sent with an ultimatum: the troops of Sauromaces were to evacuate Hiberia by the beginning of 377. The ambassadors complained that a Persian king who boasted himself to be just and contented with what was rightly his own was yet wickedly coveting Armenia when its inhabitants had been granted permission to live as it pleased them best.⁹⁹ The embassy, says Ammianus, performed its duty well, save that it went beyond its scope and accepted some small districts which were offered it in Armenia. This passage of Ammianus would seem to be explained by Faustus, who relates that Warasdat advised 'the Greek princes,' and through them the emperor, that a town or two fortresses should be built in every canton throughout Armenia as permanent garrison centres, and that the nobles and troops of Armenia should be armed at the cost of the empire to be a continual protection against Persia. The emperor willingly agreed to carry the scheme into execution. The small districts mentioned by Ammianus may thus have been intended for occupation by the Roman garrisons.

In the autumn of 376 Suren headed another embassy to the emperor offering to cede to Rome the land thus occupied, but returned with little accomplished.¹⁰⁰ Valens was raising Scythian mercenaries for an expedition against Persia in 377, when the whole position

⁹⁶ Faustus, v. 32; Amm. xxx. 1, 18-23.

⁹⁷ Faustus, v. 33.

⁹⁸ Faustus, v. 34, 'mit grossem Glanze.' Cf. the words of Ammianus, xxx. 2, 1: 'augentique nostri exercitus alacritate formidinem.'

⁹⁹ Cf. Amm. xxx. 2, 4.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* sect. 7.

VOL. XXV.—NO. C.

was changed by the news of the Gothic invasion. One highly important fact is mentioned casually by Ammianus—the Roman legions were recalled from Armenia and sent to Europe :¹⁰¹ this explains the fall of Warasdat before Manuel, which must have taken place in this year (377). Manuel having dethroned Rome's vassal king¹⁰² was forced to ally himself with Persia, and received Suren with a Persian garrison of 10,000 men, agreeing to provide for the support of these troops and to pay tribute to Sapor.¹⁰³ The account of the Armenian historian receives striking corroboration from Ammianus's narrative :

Sapor ultra solitum asperatus quod ad expeditionem accingi rectorem conpererat nostrum iram eius conculcans Surenae dedit negotium ut ea quae victor comes susceperebat et Urbicius, armis repeteret si quisquam repugnaret et milites Sauromacis praesidio destinati malis adfligerentur extremis. Haecque ut statuerat maturata confestim nec emendari potuerunt nec vindicari quia rem Romanam alias circumsteterat metus totius Gothiae, Thracias licentius perrumpentis.¹⁰⁴

In the early months of 378 Valens before leaving for Constantinople sent Victor to Persia *ut super Armeniae statu pro captu rerum conponeret impendentium*.¹⁰⁵ The disaster of Adrianople tied the hands of Rome for some years, while in Armenia Merushan¹⁰⁶ sowed discord between Manuel and Persia. The attempts of Persia to defeat Manuel were unsuccessful (378), and for seven years he ruled as regent for Pharrantsem and the sons of Pap (A.D. 378–385).¹⁰⁷ Armenia enjoyed a brief interval of peace and prosperity.¹⁰⁸ Sapor in his extreme old age was content not to interfere, for Roman intrigue in Armenia had ceased to be a danger.

In 384 an embassy arrived in Constantinople announcing the accession of Sapor III to the throne of Persia. (Sapor III, 383–388).¹⁰⁹ On Manuel's death the link of a common faith induced the great protector to commend the young king Arsak¹¹⁰ to Theodosius the

¹⁰¹ Amm. xxxi. 7, 2: 'legiones ab Armenia ductas.'

¹⁰² Warasdat fled to the empire and spent the rest of his days in exile; Faustus, v. 37.

¹⁰³ Faustus, v. 37–38.

¹⁰⁴ Amm. xxx. 2, 7–8.

¹⁰⁵ Amm. xxxi. 7, 1.

¹⁰⁶ Merushan was ultimately defeated and killed by Manuel: Faustus, v. 43. Cf. Gutschmid, *op. cit.* pp. 293–4 for criticism of the account of Moses of Chorene.

¹⁰⁷ Faustus, v. 39–41.

¹⁰⁸ 'Seine Regentschaft bildete einen Lichtpunkt in der armenischen Geschichte und war vielleicht die wenig bekannte erste Zeit des Terdat abgerechnet, die glückliche Periode deren sich die christlichen Armenier ja erfreut haben': Gutschmid, *op. cit.* p. 293. 'Die letzte gute Zeit des Reichs war die Regentschaft des klerikal-gesinnten Adelshauptes Manuels des Mamikoniers': H. Gelzer, in Hauck, *Realencyklopädie*, vol. ii. p. 66, sub voc. 'Armenien.'

¹⁰⁹ See Karl Güterbock, 'Römisch-Armenien und die römische Satrapieen im vierten bis sechsten Jahrhundert; eine rechtsgeschichtliche Studie' (in *Festgabe der juristischen Fakultät zu Königsberg für ihren Senior Johann Theodor Schirmer zum 1. August 1900*, pp. 1–58) at pp. 11 *sqq.*

¹¹⁰ Arsak had married Manuel's daughter Wardanducht: Faustus, v. 44. Cf. Gutschmid, *op. cit.* p. 294, on Moses, iii. 41, 2.

champion of orthodoxy. Many of the nobility however appealed to Persia, and Sapor III set an Arsacid prince, Chosroes, to reign in Armenia as his vassal, while the Persian noble Sik undertook the government. Arsak was forced to flee to the protection of Rome, and was supported by the army of Theodosius. But diplomacy and not war decided the claims of the rival sovereigns. An embassy from Sapor reached Constantinople in 386, and Stilicho represented the emperor at the court of Ctesiphon.¹¹¹ The former project was revived, and Armenia was partitioned between the powers who had so long distracted the unhappy country with their rivalries. Large parts of Armenia were annexed, and while Chosroes ruled over four-fifths of the remaining territory as the nominee of Persia, Arsak as Rome's protégé was sovereign over but one-fifth of the divided realm (387). 'The kingdom of Armenia,' writes her greatest historian at the close of his work, 'was reduced, partitioned, brought to ruin : it had fallen from its greatness then and for all time.'¹¹²

Our study is at an end : it has, we believe, served to illustrate and justify Gutschmid's judgment of the high value of the work of Faustus ; it has, we hope, proved that his chronology, apart from the one confusion which we noticed at the outset, is consistent and accurate—not one single error have we been able to demonstrate ; it has enabled us to appreciate the difficulties with which Rome was faced upon her eastern frontier ; and lastly it has given us a new confidence in the splendid accuracy and historical insight of Ammianus Marcellinus.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

¹¹¹ Claudian, *De consul. Stil.* 51 *sqq.*

¹¹² Faustus, vi. 1. I have not thought it necessary to repeat the arguments of Güterbock (*loc. cit.*) which in my judgment have established that A.D. 387 is the correct date for the partition of Armenia. So Hübschmann, *Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen* at p. 221. Nöldeke however (*Aufsätze*, p. 103) places it under Bahram IV (388–9–399) in 390, while Marquart, *Ērānsāhr*, p. 114 thinks that the first division of the land occurred in 384 while the king remained : the second division occurred in 389 when 'der König Arsak III verzichtete förmlich auf seine Hoheitsrechte und trat sein Land an den Kaiser ab.' Modern historians have blamed Theodosius I for this act (cf. H. Gelzer, 'in äusserster politischer Kurzsichtigkeit,' in Hauck, *loc. cit.*), but during the whole century Armenia had been *perpetua aerumnarum causa* (Amm. xxx. 2, ad init.). Theodosius needed peace in the east for his campaign against Maximus : it was also the empire's need. I believe that in this matter the great Roman emperor has been hardly judged.